```
L7gWmooC
      UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
1
      SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK
 2
 3
     UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
 4
                                              19 Cr. 112 (RMB)
                V.
5
     ANDREW MOODY,
        a/k/a "J.R.,"
6
                     Defendant.
 7
                                              Telephone Conference
      ----X
 8
                                              New York, N.Y.
9
                                              July 16, 2021
                                              10:30 a.m.
10
     Before:
11
12
                          HON. RICHARD M. BERMAN,
13
                                              District Judge
14
                                APPEARANCES
15
     AUDREY STRAUSS
16
          United States Attorney for the
          Southern District of New York
17
     BY: ROBERT B. SOBELMAN
          Assistant United States Attorney
18
19
     ANTHONY L. RICCO
      STEVEN Z. LEGON
20
          Attorneys for Defendant
21
22
23
24
25
```

Berman, and I wanted to speak to you with respect to the sentencing in this matter. I did cancel the live appearance of Mr. Moody on Tuesday, and I did so because I was concerned — and I am concerned — about this issue of the new variant and what implications that might have for any of us and anybody else who is involved with a live appearance. Maybe it's an excess of caution, but from what I'm reading in the papers, I think there is some form of an issue, and I wanted to go over it with all of you.

Now, I gather that we don't have the defendant on the phone. And first off, it is OK for us to have this conversation on the record to be sure. But in the absence of the defendant, is that OK with defense counsel?

MR. RICCO: Yes, your Honor. I'm OK with waiving
Mr. Moody's appearance because we are really just discussing
scheduling and we're discussing scheduling around a matter that
Mr. Moody is very sensitive to and is aware of, and I will be
meeting with him to discuss our scheduling result soon after
this meeting.

THE COURT: I appreciate that. I was eager to hear your opinions about how to go forward and when. A couple of issues that come to mind; you may all have discussed this with Christine Murray or with Chelsea. One issue is who has been vaccinated in our group and who may not have. I don't know if

there is anybody who has not been. I have been vaccinated and my staff has. Christine has and Chelsea has. I'm not sure who on the defense team and also on the government team have or have not been vaccinated.

Hello?

MR. RICCO: Yes, your Honor.

Your Honor, with respect to the defense --

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. RICCO: Your Honor, somebody has some background noise going on.

THE COURT: Yes. I would ask that people who are not speaking mute their phones temporarily until it's their turn, so to speak, to speak. But you were saying on behalf of the defense.

MR. RICCO: Yes, your Honor.

On behalf of the defense, both Mr. Legon and I have been fully vaccinated. I did address this issue with Mr. Moody when I was with him yesterday, your Honor, actually, for the first time in many, many months. And Mr. Moody, your Honor, has not been vaccinated, has not been vaccinated.

THE COURT: Does he plan to be?

MR. RICCO: He had not before our meeting yesterday, but I encouraged him to become vaccinated, so he said he would think about it, and I can always get back to chambers on what his decision was or is.

THE COURT: OK. I wasn't aware of that, and I would have and did call off the date just in the excess of caution, but I think this may be problematic for him and for others. I don't know. And I also don't know -- maybe you do,

Mr. Ricco -- what protocol he has to, if there is one, in order to be produced physically in person in a courtroom.

Do you know what has to happen? First of all, I think, frankly, it would be much easier if he were vaccinated, No. 1, for others and for himself. But second, do you know what kind of protocol the Bureau of Prisons requires to take someone who is unvaccinated and bring them over to the courthouse?

MR. RICCO: Judge, I don't generally know the protocol. I do know, your Honor, that it's several days out, if not at least 12 days out, but I will check that specific protocol and I will get back to chambers by way of a letter. I'll file that by way of a letter, and that is the answer to your Honor's first question.

THE COURT: That would be helpful. I don't know, by the way, if they require vaccination; that is to say, the BOP. I certainly, to the extent that I can, would like to see everybody in the courtroom. This will be one of the few occasions I've had since the pandemic a live courtroom session. The only one or two others I did have, everybody was vaccinated, so that did provide some degree of security both

for the people other than the defendant, but frankly, I think I'd have to conclude that he puts himself at some risk also if he gets transported out into an environment where there are other people. And from what I'm understanding about this variant, it can be transmitted by people who are vaccinated.

So I don't know what his feeling is about exposing himself in that way. All together, what I'm concerned about is both Mr. Moody and the rest of us and others who may be involved in the transport to and from the prison, to the courthouse. That's the reason that I have called off the Tuesday sentencing.

Now, the second issue, which is related, which I don't think we've discussed in quite some time, is whether or not the defense would be willing to have an appearance for sentencing that is either video or telephone so that in that case he would be produced by the prison to a room where there is a camera and/or a telephone. I don't know if you've thought of that possibility, or even if you have, whether in light of these what I thought I read as some new circumstances involving variant strains of the Covid, whether he is interested in rethinking whether there needs to be a live sentencing proceeding.

Now, I hesitate to say this, and I want to put it on the record. I know that it is the defendant's prerogative to have a live sentence, so to speak, and we are trying our best

to accommodate that. As a practical matter, from what I recall of the submissions, there is in this case a mandatory minimum sentence of ten years, which I believe the defense has sought as that is the lowest statutory sentence that can be imposed. So where I'm heading with this is that, in many substantial respects, he's not being prejudiced by putting off his sentencing as someone might be if there were no mandatory minimum and someone might be arguing, well, I want time served or something like that. That doesn't apply, at least it's my understanding that it does not apply to this case because of the statutory mandatory minimum of ten years, and I took that into consideration with respect to Mr. Moody so as not to prejudice his sentencing position.

Do you have any thoughts about that, defense counsel, whether he would be amenable to a video or a telephone sentencing?

MR. RICCO: Your Honor, I would first say that I certainly follow your Honor's thought process about this, and it's very similar to my own and very similar to Mr. Moody's, other than the fact that I did not discuss with him the latter part, which is whether he would be willing to waive his appearance in the event that he chooses not to be vaccinated, or if that decision would result in what I would consider a very long delay in the sentencing.

THE COURT: Right.

MR. RICCO: I certainly will take that up with him. I know that Mr. Moody wants to be present and would like to be present, but I've always found him to be very practical. And I would say, Judge, that my discussions with Mr. Moody about the vaccination really discussed his views, because he does have underlying diabetes. He's been concerned about the impact of the vaccination for a person who has diabetes, and so I had said to him that I would get him information about that if it would help him make a decision to become vaccinated, because I had encouraged him to become vaccinated in that he had a greater risk not being vaccinated with diabetes than he would with the vaccination.

I agree with your Honor's assessment, and we certainly would consent and would have no objection to putting

Mr. Moody's sentencing off until maybe sometime in September,

after Labor Day. That would give us more than enough time to

either -- he would either be vaccinated or we would have enough

time to make an assessment of what the BOP's protocols are for

defendants who are not vaccinated, perhaps a little bit more

information about the variant.

And I would just note, your Honor, that since the defendant had not been before the Court, that although Mr. Moody did contract Covid during this time period, he is in remarkable health right now. I mean he really looked very, very good when I met with him. He looked very good, and of

course, that made me feel good. So from the defense standpoint, we would consent to and agree to putting the sentence over so we can accomplish all of the concerns that the Court has raised.

THE COURT: Is he aware of the technology is if he were to proceed by videoconferencing? And let me explain that in two ways.

First of all, there have been improvements, in my opinion, with the technology and it has worked rather well. I think that the BOP delivers the person to a conference room or a nearby room not far from where they're housed regularly, and everybody can see everybody. And — and this is an important "and" — there are occasions either before or during a sentencing when an issue comes up that sometimes the defendant wishes to confer with defense counsel during the proceeding, and we have the technology — and Chelsea, who would be on the call, knows how to implement, the ability to put, so to speak, Mr. Moody and defense counsel in a private room so that the rest of us cannot hear or participate in while the attorney-client relationship and conversation takes place.

And then when that is over, if it happens, defense counsel notifies Chelsea that they're ready to come back and proceed with the sentencing, and that can happen, so that if he were concerned that he couldn't confer with counsel, that concern can be alleviated because we can make it such that he

can have consultations with counsel during the course of the proceeding.

And let's see. What else? I don't know what the medical, if there is such a thing, staff or physician at BOP suggest or if there is a suggestion for defendants who have court appearances who have not been vaccinated and those who have been, now particularly, in the context of this new variant, which seems to be causing some serious problems for people who have not been vaccinated, as I understand it.

There's a discussion there that I think needs to happen between defense counsel and Mr. Moody as well as to what the implications are of that.

Having said all that, I think all of that needs to be discussed, I'm happy to put the matter over until sometime in September, and we can pick a date in a minute. And I think you probably know this. We can pick a date. Then we get on a list, so to speak, and we're told whether that date is available by the BOP and also by the SDNY committee, which weighs in on whether there can be a production of a defendant. Chances are since it's far enough out, in September, that the day we pick will be honored. But there's always that possibility that it might not be.

Chelsea, is there any restriction to the days of the week? I'm thinking that we should pick a date in, say, the third week of September. Would it matter if we picked a

25

speak.

Monday, Tuesday or a Wednesday, something like that? 1 2 MS. TABOLT: If we want him to be produced in person, 3 then the day does not matter. 4 THE COURT: OK. What if he wanted to go forward by 5 video? 6 MS. TABOLT: If you want to do a remote proceeding, 7 then the MDC is producing defendants on Tuesdays and Thursdays 8 only. 9 THE COURT: Right. So I guess the safest thing is to 10 pick a Tuesday or a Thursday in the third week in September, 11 and that would still leave the possibility of doing either a 12 remote sentencing or an in-person sentencing. 13 Is that right, Chelsea? 14 MS. TABOLT: Yes. 15 THE COURT: Could you propose a date, Chelsea, the third week in September, Tuesday and Thursday. 16 17 MS. TABOLT: Yes. How about Thursday, September 23 at 18 noon? 19 THE COURT: Defense counsel, does that work for you, 20 9/23 at noon? 21 MR. RICCO: Actually, that Tuesday would be a better 22 date, your Honor, because we have a sentencing conflict in the 23 Eastern District on that day. It's a different time, but I 24 don't want to do anything that will rock the apple cart, so to

```
1
               THE COURT: I gotcha.
               Chelsea, was the 23rd a Thursday?
 2
 3
               MS. TABOLT: Yes. We are fully booked the Tuesday
 4
      before, but we could do the following Tuesday, the 28th.
 5
               MR. RICCO: That would be fine. Thank you, your
6
      Honor.
 7
               THE COURT:
                          9/28. What time, Chelsea?
               MS. TABOLT: 9:00.
 8
9
               THE COURT: Chelsea, I'm sorry?
10
               MS. TABOLT: 9 a.m.
11
               THE COURT:
                          Is that too early?
12
               MR. RICCO:
                          No, your Honor, it's not too early.
13
      will be fine.
14
               THE COURT: OK.
15
               Is that OK with the government as well?
16
               MR. SOBELMAN: Yes, your Honor.
17
               THE COURT: So we're saying September 28, 9 a.m., but
      as soon as defense counsel can, it would be helpful for us to
18
      know Mr. Moody's thinking.
19
20
               And then lastly, I didn't hear from the government
21
      counsel if there are any comments you want to add to this
22
      adjournment from next Tuesday to September 28 at 9 a.m.
23
               MR. SOBELMAN: No, your Honor. No substantive
24
      comments.
                We agree with the Court that in light of the
25
     mandatory minimum, it doesn't seem to be an issue to continue
```

the sentencing another time, and we'd defer to the Court and defense counsel about whether it's an in-person proceeding or a remote proceeding. We have no position on that.

THE COURT: OK. So there's our date, September 28.

I'm glad I got the chance to speak to everybody this morning,
and we'll set that date. We'll put in for that date on
whatever list we need to get on, and we'll wait to hear from
defense counsel more details as to how Mr. Moody wishes to
proceed. How's that?

MR. RICCO: Your Honor, that would be fine.

Judge, just to note, the scheduling at the MDC, for us to go there, is a little different now. As soon as we get off the phone, we're going to try to get — we have to schedule it. It's not as simple as we could just go to the jail. So we'll get a date. Usually, the date is usually about five days out for us to visit, and we'll try to have a videoconference, but even that's a couple of days off. So your Honor should be hearing from us I would say before the end of next week —

THE COURT: That's great.

MR. RICCO: -- with respect to the issues that your Honor raised.

THE COURT: That's great. Thanks, everybody, for being so helpful, and I look forward to talking to you going forward. Thanks so much. We're adjourned for today.

(Adjourned)